



OIPE	FT A !	Α	pplication Number	09/127,767				
O' TRANSMITTAL			iling Date	February 23, 2000				
JUL 2 2 2002 FORM			irst Named Inventor	Sarvar PATEL				
(to be used for all trespondence after initial filing)			roup Art Unit	2132				
TRADEMINES			xaminer Name	S. Kabakoff JUL 2 5 200				
Total Number of Pages in This S	ubmission	А	ttorney Docket Number	29250-000161/US USINDIOGY CONTROL				
	•	ENCLOSU	JRES (check all that apply)					
Fee Transmittal Form		Assignmer (for an Appl		After Allowance Communication to Group				
			e Official Draftsperson and heets of Formal Drawing(s)	Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences				
			related Papers	Reply Brief				
After Final		Petition		Proprietary Information				
Affidavits/declaration(s)			Convert to a I Application	Status Letter				
			Attorney, Revocation Correspondence Address	Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):				
		Terminal D	Disclaimer					
Express Abandonment Request		Request fo	or Refund					
☐ Information Disclosure Statement ☐ CD, I		CD, Numb	er of CD(s)					
Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)		Remarks						
Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application								
Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53								
	SIGNATUR	E OF APF	PLICANT, ATTORNEY,	OR AGENT				
Firm or Harness Individual name	, Dickey & Piero	e, P.L.Q.	Attorney Name John A. Castellano	Reg. No. 35,094				
Signature	MI							
Date July 22,		<i>V</i>						
	/							
V								

U.S. Patent and Trader ss it displays a valid OMB control number.

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, 10 persons are required to respond to a collection of information

		Complete if Known					
FEE TRANS	MITTAL	Application Number	09/127,767				
/ O'' ~ Yor FY 2	2002	Filing Date	February 23, 2000				
JUL 2 2 2002 L		First Named Inventor	Sarvar PATEL				
Paten ps are subject to	annual revision.	Examiner Name	S. Kabakoff JUL 2 5 2002				
		Group / Art Unit	2132 Tualandam O				
TOTS L'PANDED NT OF PAYMENT	(\$) 280.00	Attorney Docket No.	29250-000161/US Tuchnology Center 21				

(4) 25534								7 Morroy Docks No.						
METHOD OF PAYMENT (check one)						FEE CALCULATION (continued)								
1.			The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge indicated fees and credit any over payments to:					3. ADI	DITIONAL Large Entity	FEES	Small Entity	<del>-</del> "		
Deposit Account Number					Fee Code	Fee (\$)	Fee Code	Fee (\$)	Fee Description	Fee Paid				
					105	130	205	65	Surcharge - late filing fee or oath	$\square$				
Deposit						127	50	227	25	Surcharge - late provisional filing fee or cover sheet.				
Account Harness, Dickey & Pierce, P.L.C.						139	130	139	130	Non-English specification				
Name						147	2,520	147	2,520	For filing a request for reexamination				
						112	920*	112	920*	Requesting publication of SIR prior to Examiner action				
Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27						113	1,840*	113	1,840*	Requesting publication of SIR after Examiner action				
2.	Payme	nt Enclos	sea:					115	110	215	55	Extension for reply within first month		
☑ Check ☐ Credit card ☐ Money ☐ Other Order						116	400	216	200	Extension for reply within second month				
FEE CALCULATION						117	920	217	460	Extension for reply within third month				
BASIC FILING FEE						118	1,440	218	720	Extension for reply within fourth month				
Large	Entity		Entity					128	1,960	228	980	Extension for reply within fifth month		
Fee Code			Fee	Fee Description	n	Eoo	Paid	119	320	219	160	Notice of Appeal		
101			( <b>\$</b> ) 370	Litility filing fee			raiu	120	320	220	160	Filing a brief in support of an appeal		
106			165	Utility filing fee				121	280	221	140	Request for oral hearing	280.00	
107	510	207	255	Design filing fee Plant filing fee				138	1,510	138	1,510	Petition to institute a public use proceeding		
108			370	Reissue filing f	ee			140	110	240	55	Petition to revive – unavoidable		
114	160	214	80	Provisional filling	ng fee			141	1,280	241	640	Petition to revive - unintentional		
		en	IBTOTA	I (4)	1	(\$) (	<del></del>	142	1,280	242	640	Utility issue fee (or reissue)		
		30	БІОІА	L (1)	1	(4)	<u>,                                    </u>	143	460	243	230	Design issue fee		
2. EXTR	A CLAII	M FEES						144	620	244	310	Plant issue fee		
		PAI	D	Extra	Fee from		Fee	122	130	122	130	Petitions to the Commissioner		
Total	Г			Claims	below	Г	Paid	123	50	123	50	Processing fee under 37 CFR 1.17 (q)		
Claims		- 20	** =	×		=	0	126	180	126	180	Submission of Information Disclosure Stmt		
Independen Claims Multiple	` <u></u>	-3*	* =	0 X			0	581	40	581	40	Recording each patent assignment per property (times number of properties)		
Dependent	=			х		<del>-</del>	0	146	740	246	370	Filing a submission after final rejection (37 CFR § 1.129(a))		
Large Fee Code	Entity Fee	Small Fee Code	Entit	y Fee Descri <sub>l</sub>	otion			149	740	249	370	For each additional invention to be examined (37 CFR § 1.129(b))		
103	( <b>\$</b> ) 18	203	( <b>\$</b> ) 9	Claims in ex	cess of 20			179	740	279	370	Request for Continued Examination (RCE)		
102	84	202	42	Claims in excess of 20 Independent claims in excess of 3			'' -							
104	280	204	140					169	900	169	900	Request for expedited examination of a design application		
109	84	209	42		Multiple dependent claim, if not paid  ** Reissue independent claims over							a a adolgii appiioanaii		
110	18	210	** Paissue claims in excess of 20 and					Other fee (specify) Certified Copy of patent application						
SUBTOTAL (2) (\$) 0						*Reduced by Basic Filing Fee Paid SUBTOTAL (3) (\$) 280.00								
**Or 511	nar provén	uelu poid i	if areata	; For Reissues, s	an above									
Or HUITH	סוצאוט וטי	usiy Dalu. (	ıı uıcale)		CC DUUVE									

SUBMITTED BY		1			Con	nplete (if applicable)
Name (Print/Type)	John A. Castelfage		Registration No. Attorney/Agent)	35,094	Telephone	703-390-3030
Signature		$N_{\parallel}$	/		Date	July 22, 2002

PATENT JOB DO

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:

Sarvar PATEL

Conf.:

1713

JUL 2 5 2002

Appl. No.:

09/127,767

Group:

2132

Tuchnology Center 2100

Filed:

February 23, 2000

Examiner:

S. Kabakoff

For:

METHOD FOR TWO

PARTY AUTHENTICATION

AND KEY

AGREEMENT

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

July 22, 2002

Washington, D.C. 20231

## **REPLY BRIEF**

Sir:

Applicants respectfully request an Oral Hearing under 37 C.F.R. § 1.194(b) and include the \$280.00 fee as specified under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(d).

## **REBUTTAL AND REMARKS**

This reply brief is in response to the Examiner's Answer, Paper No. 12, mailed May 21, 2002.

#### REBUTTAL

Group I: Claims 12, 14, 15 and 18-20

The Examiner's Answer fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). In particular, the examiner has failed to establish proper motivation for using a counter value instead of the random number r<sub>A</sub> in the SKID 3 protocol of Menezes et al. Citing 07/23/2002 CKGUYEN 00000016 09127767
01 FC:121 280.00 0P

Menezes, the examiner asserts that page 397 section, 10.9 states "it typically serves to prevent undetectable replay attacks in challenge-response mechanisms."

Appellants fail to understand how this simple statement would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to use a counter value instead the random number  $r_A$  taught by Menezes et al. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that this statement found in Menezes is insufficient to motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to make the requisite change asserted by the examiner.

The examiner also states "one of ordinary skill sill in the art would have known replay attacks were used to subvert challenge-response authentication protocols, and therefore would have been familiar with choosing one of the three above options." This assertion is totally unsupported by the record. In fact, this assertion appears to be the opinion of the examiner. However, the examiner's opinion cannot be utilized to establish proper motivation under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Accordingly, appellants maintain that the examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection with respect to Group I is still deficient.

#### Group II: Claims 13 and 16

Claims 13 and 16 both require a second key be established based upon first and second challenges. In addition to relying on pages 397-405 of Menezes, the examiner now relies on page 499 as well as page 535. In modifying this rejection, the examiner appears to be piecing together portions of Menezes, which is not permitted under *In re Kotzab* 55 USPQ 2<sup>nd</sup> 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2000). Accordingly, appellants maintain that the examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection with respect to Group II is still deficient.

# Groups III, V, VI, VII, and VIII

Appellants respectfully assert that these claims are allowable for at least the additional reasons set forth above with respect to Group II.

## Group IV: Claims 21 and 22

Appellants acknowledge the examiner's indication that the rejection of these claims is overcome.

### **CONCLUSION**

Because Menezes does not teach or suggest any of the proposed modifications suggested by the examiner, applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-22 are patentable over Menezes et al.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact John A. Castellano at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any

additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

Ву

Castellano, Reg. No. 35,094 John A

P.O/Box 8910

Reston, Virginia 20195 (703) 390-3030

JAC/cah